

REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12, and 13 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer et al. (US 4,150,474).

Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 14 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al. (US 4,150,474) as applied to claims 1 and 9, and further in view of Zimmerman (US 5,293,949).

Responsive to all the above, applicants have cancelled claims 1-14 and enter new claims 15-36. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the new claims as being allowable and in proper form for at least the reasons presented herein.


Applicants would like to point out the Bauer reference does not and cannot teach the applicants invention as claimed. Bauer does not teach at least one recessed channel that extends across the width of the base portion for seating upon at least one crossmember. Furthermore, Bauer cannot teach the recessed channel that extends across the width of the said base portion because in doing so the recessed channel would interfere with the transmission case 70. Therefore, placing a recessed channel on the Bauer references as applicants claim would render the Bauer reference non-enabling.

In addition, Bauer does not and cannot teach recessed channels that are seated on the crossmembers wherein loads are transmitted across the entire width of the loader machine (pg. 9, ¶ 30). Bauer shows side beams 50 that have a relief as not to interfere with the stub axles (74,75) when mounting the main frame 24 to flanges 74a, 75a. One well versed in the art of load distribution would contest that single points of contact, as shown by the side beams 50 mounted to the flanges, would not provide a load distribution transmitted across the entire width of the loader. Even more so, Bauer cannot provide torsional stiffness as disclosed in applicants application, and claimed in newly added claim 20, because Bauer does not and cannot teach a recessed channel extending across the width of the base portion and seated on at least one crossmember.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bauer, nor Bauer in further view of Zimmerman, teaches nor suggests applicants invention as now claimed, and it is respectfully

urged that the subject application is in condition for allowance and allowance of the application at issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason J. Stanley  
Registration No. 47,962  
Intellectual Property Attorney  
Caterpillar Inc.

Telephone: (309) 675-5187  
Facsimile: (309) 675-1236